

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 6, 2003. Claims 2-24, 26-42, 44-49, 51, 53-75, 77-93, 95-100, 102 and 104-106 are presented for examination. Claims 3, 5, 6, 19-24, 26-32, 38-40, 44-46, 54, 70-75, 77-83, 89-92, 95-97 and 104-106 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 19, 38, 44, 70, 89, 95 and 104-106 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 2-20, 23, 24, 27, 32, 35-37, 53-71, 74, 75, 78, 83, 86-88 and 104 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,220,674 (Morgan et al.) in view of U.S. Patents 5,764,892 (Cain et al.) and 5,358,238 (Mandel et al.). Claims 15, 21, 22, 26, 28-31, 33, 34, 38-42, 44-49, 51, 66, 72, 73, 77, 79-82, 84, 85, 89-93, 95-100, 102, 105 and 106 were each rejected as being obvious from those three patents taken in combination, severally, with well-known prior art, or admitted prior art, or U.S. Patent 5,485,246 (Hayashi et al.).

Generally speaking, Claims 19, 70 and 104 have been amended to recite selecting a response addressee, a response medium and a response message (including an opening or closing phrase in accordance with the selected response medium). Claims 44, 95 and 106 have been amended to recite permitting selection of a re-response procedure such that a re-response addressee or a re-response medium of the re-response procedure is different from that of a previous response procedure which has led to the previous response that could not be managed by that person. Claims 38, 89 and 105 have been amended to recite permitting selection of a re-response procedure such that a response addressee or a

response medium of the re-response procedure is different from that of an earlier response procedure that has led to a failed response.

In contrast, *Morgan* relates to a system in which a local area print server 10 monitors a status of events occurring internally and within a printer 16a, 16b. This enables the local area print server 10 to respond to status queries from other components that are part of the network 12. The local area print server 10 can arrange to have an appropriate message displayed on an appropriate operator console 20 whenever one of the printers 16a, 16b needs paper (col. 7, lines 30-49). Applicants submit, however, that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Morgan* that would teach or suggest selecting a response medium in accordance with discriminated error-type, and preparing a response text by appending an opening or closing phrase, as recited in these claims.

Cain relates to a host monitoring system C that notifies an owner of the status of a client device A via suitable communication means such as electronic mail N1, fax N2, telephone N3, or pager N4 (col. 4, lines 20-29). Then, the program determines the preferred preselected notification method 50, and formulates the message according to the preselected method (col. 10, lines 43-47, and Fig. 2D). Nothing has been found in *Cain*, however, that would teach or suggest how the suitable communication means are selected. Nor does anything in *Cain* appear to disclose a process of preparing text by appending an opening or closing phrase to a selected response message in a text form, as recited in Claim 1, and indeed, even if *Cain* were combined with *Morgan* in the manner proposed in the Office Action (and even assuming such combination would be permissible), the result would not have these features.

Moreover, even if *Mandel* is deemed to show all that it is cited for in the Office Action, such would not supply what is missing from the proposed combination of *Morgan* and *Cain*. Accordingly, Claims 19, 70 and 104 are believed to be clearly allowable over these three documents, taken separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

Applicants further submit that nothing has been found, or pointed out by the Examiner, in *Morgan*, *Cain* and *Mandel*, taken separately or together, that would teach or suggest these features independent Claims 38, 44, 89, 95, 105 and 106, which accordingly are also deemed to be clearly allowable over those patents.

A review of the other art of record, including *Hayashi*, as well as what the Office Action characterized as well-known prior art and admitted prior art, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 444620v1